

Amendment in Reply to the Final Office Action of November 21, 2007
and the Advisory Action of January 24, 2008

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 21, 2007, and the Advisory Action mailed on January 24, 2008, which have been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 remain in this application, where claim 16 had been canceled without prejudice and claims 21-22 have been added. Claims 1 and 18 are independent.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2-3 for not clearly reciting how to calculate diffuseness or curvature of the discharge arc. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 2-3 are clear and that one skilled in the art, in view of the specification and common knowledge, would know how to calculate diffuseness. For example, curvature may be measured in accordance with the United Nations Economic Communication (UNECE), Regulation No. 99, Uniform provisions

concerning approval of gas discharge light sources for use in approved gas discharge lamp units of power driven vehicles, 15 April 1996, as recited on page 10, lines 15-21 of the specification. Further, the Examiner admits that it is known how to calculate diffuseness by the alleging that U.S. Patent No. 5,723,937 (Whitman) anticipates claims 2-3. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 2-3 is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to remove the alleged informality noted by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of 1-15 and 17-20 has been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,723,937 (Whitman). Further, claims 5 and 9-10

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Whitman. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-15 and 17-22 are patentable Whitman for at least the following reasons.

Whitman is directed to a directed to a lamp having a light-scattering coating 26. As specifically recited on column 2, line 46, the light-scattering coating 26 contains light-scattering particles 30. As clearly shown in FIG 1(b), the light-scattering particles 30 are separated from each other along an axis connecting a set of the particles 30, and do NOT overlap.

In stark contract, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 18, amongst other patentable elements requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein a surface of at least one of the inner vessel and the outer bulb comprises a pattern configured to increase a diffuseness of the discharge arc, wherein the pattern includes structured arrangements formed on the surface, the structured arrangements being overlapping over each other along an axis connecting a set of the structured arrangements.

A pattern that includes structured arrangements formed on the surface, where the structured arrangements are overlapping along an axis connecting a set of the structured arrangements is nowhere

taught or suggested in Whitman. It is respectfully submitted that the Whitman coating 26, (which is coated over the outer envelope surface 22 and) which contains light-scattering particles 30, is not analogous to "a pattern [that] includes structured arrangements formed on the surface," as recited in independent claims 1 and 18.

Even, assuming arguendo, that the Whitman coating 26 is analogous to the particular pattern formed on a surface, as clearly shown in FIG 1(b) of Whitman, the light-scattering particles 30 do NOT overlap along an axis connecting a set of the particles. Rather, the Whitman particles 30 are separated along an axis connecting a set of them.

For example, viewing the top horizontal line in FIG 1(b) as an axis connecting a set the Whitman particles 30, then clearly the particles 30 along this top horizontal line are separated from each other, and do NOT overlap. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Whitman of a "pattern [that] includes structured arrangements formed on the surface, the structured arrangements being overlapping over each other along an axis connecting a set of the structured arrangements," as recited in independent claims 1

and 18.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 18 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15, 17 and 19-20 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 18.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Amendment in Reply to the Final Office Action of November 21, 2007
and the Advisory Action of January 24, 2008

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Dan Halajian*

Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703

Attorney for Applicant(s)

April 18, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

Applied Technology Center

111 West Main Street

Bay Shore, NY 11706

Tel: (631) 665-5139

Fax: (631) 665-5101